REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-9, 14, 17-21, 35-43, 46-52, 55, 56 and 61-70 were pending in this application when last examined by the Examiner. Claims 1, 35, 56, 63, 66-67, and 70 have been amended. Claims 71-72 have been added. Claim 55 has been deleted. The amendments find full support in the original specification, claims, and drawings. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-7, 17-20, 35-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Srinivasan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,357,042). Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srinivasan in view of Shoff et al (U.S. Patent 6,240,555). Claims 21, 50-52, 55, 56, 63-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)as being unpatentable over Srinivasan in view of Wistendahl et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,496,981). Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srinivasan in view of Oguro et al (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0033739). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Independent claims 1 and 35 have been amended to include limitations similar to the limitations of claim 55. Claim 55 has been canceled.

Amended claims 1 and 35 now recite an "object mapping table including at least one entry with an indicia from the corresponding mask identifying a particular video object, the entry further storing an identifier to a corresponding one of a plurality of information data structures included in one or more of the plurality of object data packets, the corresponding information data structure including information associated with the particular video object." The Examiner acknowledges that Srinivasan does not teach the claimed "object mapping table." However, the Examiner relies on Wistendahl to make up for this deficiency.

Wistendahl is directed to an authoring system for generating object mapping data ("hot spots") for a media content. (Abstract). This is accomplished by specifying the display location coordinates of selected objects within a frame or series of frames of a display and their frame addresses. The display location coordinates and frame addresses of the "hot spots" are stored as "N data" separately from the media content. (Col. 5, lines 30-35). An interactive digital media program (IDM) resident in the TV set top box responds to user selections of the "hot spots" by

launching further layers of display presentations and/or triggering other program functions. (Abstract, Col. 5, lines 43-49).

Although Wistendahl's N data contains identifying information of a hot spot, the N data is not the claimed "object mapping table" because it does not have entries "storing an identifier to a corresponding one of a plurality of information data structures," as is now claimed in claims 1 and 35. There is no teaching or suggestion in Wistendahl that the disclosed N-data store anything other than the display location coordinates of the hot spot areas.

Wistendahl also fails to teach or suggest the claimed "plurality of information data structures." Wistendahl's IDM program is not the claimed "plurality of information data structures" because, first, the IDM program is not a data structure, but rather, an executable program. (See, Col. 5, lines 39-49). Second, Wistendahl fails to teach anything other than one IDM program per media presentation. Thus, even if, *arguendo*, the N data were to identify the IDM program, it would not identify one of a plurality IDM programs.

There is in fact no suggestion or motivation to modify Wistendahl's N data so that it store an "identifier" to an IDM program. This is because it is the IDM program that identifies and accesses the N data, and not vice versa. (See, Col. 5, lines 38-49). That is, nothing in Wistendahl teaches or suggests that it is the N data that identifies and accesses the IDM program. Accordingly, claims 1 and 35 are now in condition for allowance.

Independent claims 63 and 67 include limitations that are similar to the limitations of claims 1 and 35 which make claims 1 and 35 allowable. Accordingly, claims 63 and 67 are also in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 35.

Claims 2-9, 14, 17-21, 36-43, 46-52, 56, 61-62, 64-66, and 68-70 are also in condition for allowance because they depend on an allowable base claim, and for the additional limitations that they contain.

Claims 71 and 72 are new in this application. Claims 71 and 72 are in condition for allowance because they depend on an allowable base claim, and for the additional limitations that they contain. Specifically, claim 71 recites that "the corresponding information data structure is an object properties table storing one or more second entries, wherein each of the one

or more second entries includes an information category and an identifier to a second one of the plurality of information data structures providing details for the information category." Wistendahl fails to teach or suggest the claimed "object properties table." Accordingly, claim 71 is also in condition for allowance for this additional limitation.

Claim 72 recites that "each mask includes a visibility bit indicative of whether the video objects appearing in the corresponding video frame are enabled for being visually identified for a particular video shot." None of the cited references teach or suggest this limitation. Accordingly, claim 72 is also in condition for allowance for this additional limitation.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration and an early indication of allowance of the now-pending claims 1-9, 14, 17-21, 35-43, 46-52, 56, 61-72 are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By _____
Josephine E. Chang
Reg. No. 46,083
626/795-9900

JEC/lal

LAL PAS757800.1-*-09/28/07 4:09 PM